DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 662 CE 040 592

AUTHOR Meyer, Katrina A.
TITLE Part-Time Employment of High-School Youth: Differences in Status and Monetary Reward Based on Selected Characteristics.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; Demography; *Employment Level; *Employment Patterns; Ethnic Origins; Family Characteristics; Grade Point Average; High Schools; *High School Students; Influences; Occupational Aspiration; *Part Time Employment; *Salary Wage Differentials; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Role; State Surveys; Student Characteristics; Youth Employment

ABSTRACT

A study examined the patterns of differential status and reward existing among high school students to determine whether the sex-related patterns of salary and employment status discrimination that exist in society as a whole are mirrored in the occupational experiences of in-school adolescent workers. To gather data for the study, the researcher administered questionnaires to 2,787 students from 39 public and private schools in the state of Washington who had part-time jobs. Data obtained from the survey instrument were analyzed to determine the mutual relation of the following variables: student gender, year in school, postgraduation plans, ethnic origin, grade point average, occupational status, and wages, as well as father's occupational status. On average, males earned more than their female counterparts in higher-status occupations. The adolescent wages examined in the study produced a statistically significant relationship and a 90 percent wage gap as opposed to the 65 percent wage gap that exists between the wages of males and females in the general labor market. Recommendations called for further research to determine the factors responsible for this discrepancy. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED253662

Part-Time Employment of High-School Youth:

Differences in Status and Monetary Reward Based On Selected Characteristics

by

Katrina A. Meyer, Ph.D.

Commission for Vocational Education
Airdustrial Park, Bldg. 17
Mail Stop LS-10
Olympia, Washington 98504

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper presented at 1985 AERA Conference

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K Meyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE040592

Introduction

In the burgeoning literature on sex differences, a large portion of the attention of social scientists and policymakers has been concentrated on describing and explaining a persistent, and sizeable, wage gap. Adult women have been earning, and continue to earn, only two-thirds of the contents of men's paychecks. This wage differential exists at the same time women's average occupational status is the same as men's, women's participation in the labor force continues to increase, and legal precedence has been set for the acceptance--if not implementation--of the concept known as "comparable worth." Very little research has been done, however, into the chronological antecedents of the adult woman's pay gap: that is, the experience of the employed adolescent female.

High school students are participating in the labor force in an ever increasing number. Part-time jobs offer monetary and experiential benefits to the adolescent, but do they offer these benefits equitably to both young males and females? The main objective of the present research was to determine whether the patterns of differential status and reward that exist for adults were mirrored in the occupational experiences of in-school adolescent workers.

Theoretical Framework

Two general classes of theory have been used by many researchers as they attempt to explain an adult's occupational status and earnings. While not all researchers pose the issues in just such a manner, the two theories do provide a useful framework for presenting and discussing relevant

literature.

These two theories provide different explanations of how individuals become allocated to different-status employment or rewarded at different levels. Functionalism makes several of the same assumptions as neo-classical economics and bears a resemblance to human capital theory (Horan, 1978; Bibb & Form, 1977; and Beck, Horan & Tolbert, 1978). Functionalist theory proposes that a person's occupational status and wage rate are the result of the individual's abilities and characteristics being identified and rewarded in an open, fully competitive marketplace for labor. Specifically applied to women's employment experiences, human capital theory attributes earnings differences to women's lower productivity, lesser seniority, and intermittent labor force attachment (Roos, 1981). Functionalist theory, such as human capital theory, suggests that low status and low wages flow from the individual worker's characteristics.

However, the assumptions behind functionalism have been criticized. The human capital approach assumes that men and women have equal access to occupations and that no institutional or societal constraints exist (Roos, 1981). Structuralism has been increasingly proposed as an alternative to the functionalist stance by researchers seeking to account for income differentials of women and blacks, as compared to white men (Berg, 1981; Kerckhoff, 1976; Bibb & Form, 1977; and Beck et al., 1978). Structuralist theory emphasizes the role of extra-individual or structural forces that allocate individuals into occupations or reward their efforts on the basis of a group characteristic, such as gender or race, or their placement in an external structure, such as the dual labor market or an occupation with no, or minimal, promotion ladder (Wolf & Rosenfeld, 1978). Structuralist

theory, therefore, suggests that low status and low wages result from different opportunities available to a certain type of individual.

The question as it pertains to adolescents experiencing the labor market during high school is whether functionalist theory explains the socioeconomic status and monetary reward of the in-school youth's present job. However, status and reward may be better explained by structuralist theory since adolescents work at the types of jobs they are allowed to by entry-level skills' requirements and restrictive labor legislation.

As so well put by Kerckhoff (1976), at issue are two alternative explanations for the same phenomena. It is simplistic to proceed upon the assumption that functionalism and structuralism are mutually exclusive. One need not accept one theory in its totality and feel obligated to reject the other. Indeed, the present research does not and can not settle the functional/structural argument. Each theory provides a plausible explanation for identical situations. While this sort of ambiguity may not be comfortable to everyone, it is not disabling. It serves to reinforce an awareness that interpretation is dependent upon which side of the theoretical framework one is, at the moment, indulging the assumptions.

Review of Literature

In the research on adults, both the socioeconomic status of an occupation and that occupation's wages have been investigated. Occupational socioeconomic status (SES) has been the outcome variable of interest in the status attainment literature which has attempted to capture what factors can be said to impact an adult's final occupational placement. By using an occupation's SES to stand for a person's achievement, researchers

have found that men and women have, on the average, jobs of similar prestige or SES (Treiman & Terrell, 1975; Featherman & Hauser, 1976; and McClendon, 1976). Sewell, Hauser, and Wolf (1980), in an 18-year follow-up of the Wisconsin studies, actually found an advantage to women: their first jobs were usually higher in occupational status than their male peers; however, this advantage dissipated over time until at mid-life, men and women's status were the same. These studies, and others, have lead to a general acceptance of the idea that placement within the occupational status structure is nearly the same for both males and females and that the process whereby men and women find themselves in occupations is also similar.

However, these findings have been criticized both for the measures used and the assumptions made. Powers (1982) suggested that these results of statistical equality might be an artifact of the researchers' choice of measuring tool, i.e., Duncan's unidimensional socioeconomic index (SEI) or other similar measures. Originally based on a sample of men's occupations, the SEI tends to obscure the fact that women and men have different patterns of concentration within the occupational hierarchy (McClendon, 1976), with women clustered in occupations ranked in the middle of the SEI and men in occupations ranked highest and lowest. Others have criticized the status attainment literature because of its underlying functionalist assumptions (Horan, 1978) and its ignoring of such structural factors as a sex-segregated job market and the dual labor market (Powers, 1982; Bibb & Form, 1977; and Berg, 1981). These researchers wonder whether women face a dual opportunity structure that influences their achievement of occupational status and equitable reward.

The evidence on adult women's wages as a proportion to men's runs

counter to the results of the research on attainment of socioeconomic status. From 1960 to 1978, this proportion remained steadily around 60% (Mallan, 1982) and climbed to 64% in 1983 (Business Week, 1985). The slight closing of the gap has been credited to the gains in women's pay for women in the college-educated, 24-to-35 age bracket (Mallan, 1982).

Explaining the existence of this persistent wage gap has been the object of study by social scientists, human resource analysts, and policy-makers. Human capital theory proposed that women earned less because of their lower productivity due to lower educational attainment, intermittent attachment to the labor force, and consequent lesser work experience. In Brown's (1978) study, factors identified as leading to higher male earnings were differences for women in their return to investment in human capital, rate of employment, and return on experience.

Yet there is further evidence for questioning the human capitalist's reasoning. Blinder (1973) found that men had a higher return on investment from their education even as women were attaining similar levels of education. Corcoran and Duncan (1979) found that males' greater attachment to the labor force and better qualifications could not explain the wage gap. Mallan (1982) detailed pay/experience profiles for men and women and found women's profile to be lower and flatter than men's while Roos' (1982) 12-nation regression analysis on wages found gender differences in the process of occupational allocation. Angle and Wissmann's (1983) study produced evidence that age and not work experience affected earnings; due to the non-significant differences between men and women in their work experience, the study concluded that men's wages increase as they age, but not women's. In a similar vein, Medoff and Abraham (1980) studied the earnings of

managerial and professional employees of several companies and found a strong, positive relationship between experience on the job and earnings but a negative association between experience and performance. Clearly, the implication could be that simple explanations of wage determination (i.e., an individual is rewarded for their productivity and performance) do not explain all persons'--specially women's--experiences.

Structuralist explanations have also been proposed for the wage gap between men and women. Blumrosen (1980), McLaughlin (1978), and Roos (1981) found the sex-based segregation of occupations to be a factor in lowering women's wages; increased percentages of males in an occupation lead to higher earnings for women. But sex segregation was not sufficient explanation for King (1977), who found evidence of intra-occupational earnings differences. Another structuralist argument has pointed out women's differential placement in a segmented labor market; greater numbers of women in secondary labor market jobs decrease their earnings in relationship to men who predominate in the primary labor market (Rosenfeld, 1979; Bibb & Form, 1977; and Griffin, Kalleborg & Alexander, 1981).

Another hypothesis for the earnings gap is less enjoyably tested. But evidence continues to be found for the existence of discrimination against females and discriminatory practices (Beller, 1982; Treiman & Roos, 1983). Gunderson (1978) found that one-half of the earnings gap from the 1970 Census could be attributed to discrimination while Filer (1983) found that inserting variables capturing individual tastes and personalities may have lowered the estimate of discrimination, but left discrimination as an explanation still to be reckoned with. Almost by way of elimination, after investigating the effects of human capital variables and structural varia-

bles, discrimination has become a viable explanatory force.

This partial review of the research on adults serves to place in contrast the research on adolescents' achievement of occupational socioeconomic status and monetary reward for their services. These sorts of achievements of adolescents have not been of overarching concern to researchers because the primary responsibility of high school students is still perceived to be attending and succeeding at school. Their part-time jobs are largely secondary in importance and research has only studied how these jobs affect the student's academic or other school-related successes and other occupational characteristics considered important for future occupational success, i.e., vocational maturity, knowledge of occupations, and occupational aspiration.

But these part-time jobs do have socioeconomic status. Endriss and Froomkin (1980) found differences in males' and females' participation in types of occupations; generally, females were more likely to have service or clerical jobs while males were more frequently in blue-collar jobs. Roughly translated into a socioeconomic scale, females were probably in higher SES occupations. But basically the problem with attaching too much importance to the occupational SES of an adolescent's job is two-fold: first, in-school jobs do not have any significant impact on the individual's occupational aspirations (Meyer, 1984) and thus may not influence later occupational achievements, and second, jobs open to high-school students are striking in their homogeneity. That is, kids work at jobs they're allowed to work at: usually entry-level, low-status, low-paying, secondary labor market jobs (Young, 1983). In other words, basically similar jobs are open to both males and females.

However, adolescent wages from these jobs are not too dissimilar from the relationship existent between their parents' wages. In a 1976 survey, Endriss and Froomkin (1980) found that females aged 14-21 earned 87.3% of males the same ages. D'Amico's (1984) sophomore, junior, and senior females earned 79.6%, 89.5%, and 95% of males in the same class. An Ohio Department of Education (1984) study of 1982 vocational education graduates saw male high school graduates earn more than females in 71 of 91 occupations; post-secondary female graduates did better: males earned more in 26 of 40 occupations. It is difficult to know how to interpret these findings. On one hand, young women are doing better in comparison to their brothers than adult women are when compared against adult men. However, if adolescents are working at similar jobs, then a wage gap still obviously exists.

While little research has looked into the determinants of adolescent wages as has been done with adult earnings, a study by D'Amico (1984) offered some evidence that age and work experience do seem correlated with wages. For both sexes, sophomores earned less than juniors who earned less than seniors; sophomores were also working less hours per week than juniors, who were working less hours per week than seniors; and sophomores had had fewer employers than juniors, who had had fewer employers than seniors. While this may not seem a remarkable observation, it does imply that as adolescents, males and females are rewarded for greater experience and age even though the wage gap is never closed. As adults, women do not seem as rewarded for their work experience or age (Angle & Wissmann, 1983; Mallan, 1982) and the wage gap experienced by adolescents seems to widen until it reaches the present equilibrium of around 60%.

Because the nature of the research on adolescent employment is some-

times scanty, it is logical to ask whether such variables as ethnic origin or post-graduation plans affect adolescent occupational SES and wages as both race and college attendance have been shown to influence adult SES and wages. Racial discrimination may impact the kinds of jobs adolescents can get and the amount of wages they are given. Just as having attended college changes the types of jobs an adult can enter, and thus changing the level of earnings, perhaps the intent to go on to college after high school graduation also impacts the adolescent's type of job and wage rate. The college-bound, because of their ability or their attractiveness to employers, may have a better opportunity to seek and gain higher-status and higher-paying part-time jobs.

As already just mentioned, the individual's ability has an influence on the type or socioeconomic level of occupation that is available to him or her. The status attainment literature on adults has traced the impact of both an ability variable (such as IQ or Grade Point Average) and father's occupational SES on occupational placement; clearly, the moderating effect of ability and family socioeconomic level should be taken into consideration.

The present research attempted to determine whether the patterns of differential occupational status and reward that have been described for adults also exist for high school, adolescent workers. In order to perform as complete an analysis as could be permitted, the effects of gender, year in high school, ethnic origin, post-graduation plans, student ability, and family socioeconomic status were investigated.

Methodology

The raw data used in this research were elicited through administration

of a survey instrument validated and replicated in the course of sampling 4,317 students from 31 public high schools, five public alternative high schools, two private high schools, and one skills center in the State of Washington. The schools include representation from the major cities, suburbs, smaller cities scattered throughout the state, and small agricultural towns. Schools were selected based on a stratified sampling technique that ensured inclusion of schools from all major communities and geographic regions. Though not strictly random, selection had to be based on the acquisition of the principal's permission to conduct the study; thus pertinent data were compared post facto with data from the Washington State High School and Beyond (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1981) study. While no systematic bias was apparent, blacks were statistically underrepresented in the sample.

With the assistance of school principals, teachers were identified who taught a course required for high school graduation in which enrollment was primarily seniors. Because all students in each class completed the questionnaire, 1438 juniors and 660 sophomores were included with 2178 seniors. Teachers distributed the questionnaires in all their classes one day midweek during May 1983. Students completed the questionnaire and the responses from each class were placed in an envelope and mailed directly to the principal investigator. The subsample of interest were the 2787 students with part-time jobs.

The questionnaire included several items of a purely demographic nature: gender (males--44.3%; females--55.7%), year in school (sophomores--14.7%; juniors--34.9%; seniors--50.4%), and ethnic origin (caucasian--94.0%; asian--4.0%; black--2.0%). Students were also asked questions which allowed the construction of a variable labelled, "post-graduation plans" that con-

sisted of those students planning on working full time (10.0%) and those planning on attending a post-secondary educational institution (90.0%). Each student also indicated their present grade point average (GPA) on the basic four-point scale.

Answers provided by respondents to questions about occupations needed to be transformed into a useful socioeconomic form. The latest update of Duncan's socioeconomic index (SEI) of occupations, based on the 1970 Census (Powers, 1982), was used for coding an occupation's socioeconomic standing. The SEI, based on an estimate of an occupation's educational requirements, earnings, and prestige, was chosen because of its stability over time and well-researched characteristics. The mean SEI of the employed students was 12.77, which reveals two shortcomings to the use of the SEI for adolescents: first, adolescents are clustered into lower-SEI occupations and second, reliability may be affected. Employment data supplied for 83% of the fathers produced a mean SEI of 42.6.

Not quite half (or 1374 of 2787) of the student workers provided their present hourly wage. These wage rates ranged from $1.00 per hour to $9.00 per hour, for a mean wage of $3.95.

Analyzing the sample data involved testing the contributions of gender, year in school, ethnic origin, and post-graduation plans (all nominal variables) to explaining the workers' present job SEI and monetary reward (hourly pay) through analysis of variance. All two- and three-way interactions were tested as were two covariates: an ability variable (GPA) and father's occupational SEI (as the best indicator of family socioeconomic status). The significant main or interactive contributors to explained variance were further investigated by calculating the mean SEI and wage for

the relevant subgroups.

Results

In the interest of reporting the results as succintly as possible, the four independent, two moderator, and two outcome variables were assigned labels to simplify tables. The variable labels and names are as follows:

X_1 Gender

X_2 Year in School

X_3 Post-Graduation Plans

X_4 Ethnic Origin

X_5 GPA

X_6 Father's Occupational SEI

Y_1 Adolescent's Occupational SEI

Y_2 Adolescent's Wages

In the ANOVA of the independent and covariate variables on the occupational status (SEI) of the adolescent's part-time job (see Table 1), both covariates made a significant contribution to explained variance (F=12.958, p=.001). Gender (F=25.414, p=.001) and year in school (F=56.310, p=.001) had significant main effects but ethnic origin and post-graduation plans did not. Only one of the possible six two-way interactions was significant: gender by year in school (F=10.556, p=.001). The three-way interactions as a group did not make a significant contribution to explaining youth's present job SEI, and while one three-way interaction was significant, it included the effect of ethnic origin. Given the statistical underrepresentation of blacks in the present sample, it is unwise to place undue emphasis on this result.

Insert Table 1 about here

In the ANOVA on monetary reward (see Table 2), the covariates did not make a significant contribution as a group, though singly father's SEI did produce a significant F-ratio (F=5.002; p=.026). The significant main effects were the same as for the previous ANOVA: gender (F=37.988, p=.001) and year in school (F=9.365, p=.001). The only two-way interaction to make a significant contribution to explaining wages was ethnic origin by year in school (F=2.948, p=.019) and again, the three-way interactions as a group did not produce a significant F-ratio. Because the significant two- and three-way interactions include ethnic origin, the caution applied in the previous instance should be applied.

Inspection of the mean SEI and wage (see Tables 3 and 4) for the significant main and two-way effects reveals different trends. Males worked in jobs producing a lower mean SEI but a higher mean wage than the jobs of females. On one hand, the males' jobs had a mean SEI that was 74.13% of females' jobs, while on the other hand, females had a mean wage that was 90.4% of males' mean wage.

In a more consistent result, sophomores had jobs with a mean SEI and wage lower than juniors' jobs, and juniors had jobs with a mean SEI and wage lower than seniors' job; this was true for both males and females. By transforming these means to percentages, it becomes clearer that sophomores increase their occupational SEIs faster than their wages: sophomores' mean SEI is 36.31% of seniors' mean SEI while juniors' mean SEI is 70.61% of seniors' mean SEI; however, sophomores' mean wage is 88.86% of seniors'

mean wage while juniors' mean wage is 95.79% of seniors' mean wage. This may be due to the minimum wage creating an artificial ceiling effect or the actual increase in usefulness of the older adolescent.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

Discussion

Before embarking upon a discussion of these results, two large provisos concerning the nature of the present data must be made clear. First, as noted during the reporting of the significant two- and three-way interactions, the variable capturing ethnic origin reflected a serious underrepresentation of blacks in the sample. This was due to the difficulty in receiving permission to administer the questionnaire in inner-city schools, which contain the majority of Washington's black population. It was therefore necessary to treat any significant results from the inclusion of this variable with extreme caution. Second, caution must also be taken to not overinterpret the results of the adolescents' occupational SEIs. The SEI scale runs from 1 to 96 but our working adolescents were clustered primarily in the bottom third, as would seem reasonable. However, this is a misuse of the Duncan SEI and may have affected the reliability of the results. Further research on adolescent occupational socioeconomic status, especially were the goal to compare such results to prior research on adults, should use the SEI with reluctance.

Even with the limitations of the present data, perhaps some tentative observations can be made until refuted at some later time. First, the two

covariates entered into the analysis of variance--i.e., the individual's GPA and his/her father's occupational SEI--were significant, as a group, for both outcome variables, but seemed to have different individual relationships. The relationship of an offspring's occupational SEI to both an ability factor (such as GPA) and the family's socioeconomic position (represented by the father's occupational SEI) has been established by research done in the status attainment field. The result shouldn't be too surprising, even though the offspring in this instance is not a young adult but the adolescent high school student.

What is interesting to note is the continued influence of father's occupational SEI on adolescent wages, but the lack of relationship between ability and wages. This presents two problems. First, does the adolescent already coming from a higher socioeconomic family have additional advantages when they reach the marketplace and receive their first paychecks? Do not these results imply that such adolescents also receive better jobs (higher in SEI) and greater pay? Second, if ability or GPA does not seem to be related to wage rates, if it is not identified and rewarded in some equitable manner as human capital theory tells us, what is operating? Besides presenting evidence that rejects the application of human capital theory to adolescent wage determination, the data may imply that external factors such as the minimum wage or the value placed on adolescent labor vis-à-vis adult labor keep adolescent wages artificially constrained between the legislated minimum and a subjective maximum at which adolescents compete equally with adults. In either case, the wages of adolescents seem very homogeneous.

The second observation regards the disparate relationship of occupational SEI and wages for adolescents. While no test of relationship was

conducted, it would seem a fair guess, and worth further investigation, that occupational SEI does not have a particularly strong relationship to wages for adolescents. Having a higher SEI job did not seem to raise the wages of females and conversely, working at a lower SEI job didn't mean lower wages for males.

In a third observation, the results from the present research as it regards occupational SEI for adolescents is not at second glance inconsistent with similar research on adults' occupational status. For adolescents, occupational SEI was related to both gender and year in school. Adolescent girls were more likely to be working at "pink-collar" jobs (i.e., clerical, sales, or service) which have higher SEI ranks in the Duncan scale. The adolescent boys were more likely to be working at manual or craft jobs which have lower SEI ranks. The difference is, therefore, the result of how the Duncan SEI determines ranks for occupations. But one might remark that this difference between young men and women is not consistent with the seeming similarity between adult men and women's mean SEIs. Yet it must be remembered that men have occupational SEIs that are more likely to be at the top and the bottom of the SEI scale while women are grouped in occupations ranked near the middle of the scale. The adolescent males may be unable to equal their sisters due to being barred from the higher-SEI occupations (due to lack of education and experience) that allows adult men to equal, on average, women's mean SEI.

The present results are also consistent with research on adults with respect to the growth in occupational SEI that comes with age. At least for these adolescents, it is assumed that the increased education and experience associated with progressing another year in school is rewarded with a

higher SEI job which provides at least partial support for a human capital approach to adolescent labor market experience.

The fourth observation deals with the differences in adolescent wages and presents more complex problems. Wages were related to both gender and year in school, but only the relationship to year in school was similar to the results for occupational SEI. Just as was the case previously, adding a year in age (and assuming an increase in education and experience) increased the adolescent's wage rate and confirmed a partial support once again for the human capital explanation. However, some of the words of caution as it regards the compressing of the adolescent's available wage rates (due to minimum-wage legislation and the competition from decreasing adult wage rates) might be advisable here as well. Until a detailed analysis of the factors which affect adolescent wage determination has been done, these explanations may be plausible, but unproven.

The relationship of wages to gender adds the requisite complexity. Not only is this relationship different from the relationship of occupational SEI to gender, but it provides mixed messages about the wage gap and confused messages about the relationship of wages to types of occupations. In the first message, adolescent females earn less than males even as they are working in occupations with higher SEIs than their brothers; they produced a wage gap of 90% for the total sample. This is better than adult females' gap of 65%, but it is a significant gap nonetheless. In the second message, occupations with career ladders are said to be lower-paying during training but with a steeper pay/experience profile afterwards. If this is true, then the adolescent females studied would be in occupations with career ladders, yet they are disproportionately in jobs that have little traditional career

growth (i.e., clerical, sales clerk, and service occupations). On the other hand, occupations without career ladders are higher paying initially but with flatter pay/experience profiles thereafter. If this is true, the adolescent males in this study should expect to have slower wage growth, which, if research on adults is reliable, will not be the case.

Clearly, the evidence on adolescent wages is not excruciatingly clear. Further research should investigate the possibility of intra-occupation differences in male-female wages. Inclusion of these variables, and relevant others, into a regression analysis should look for the relative influence of each variable on the adolescent's wage. Survey or interview data from employers of adolescents should also enlighten our understanding of the wage determination process.

Conclusions

The present research infers that differential labor market opportunity for in-school adolescents exists for groups with different characteristics. While this is not a new finding for the adult labor force, it has not been conclusively established for adolescents. The present disadvantage of males in their occupational SEI is interesting in light of their earning, on average, more than their sisters in higher-status occupations. The consistent advantage of growing older for both males and females is similar to the experience of adult males but not, perhaps, for adult females (Angle & Wissmann, 1983).

Three further insights may be gleaned from the present study. First, the wage gap experienced by adult females is mirrored in the experiences of adolescent females. However, while adolescent wages produced a statistically

significant relationship and a 90% wage gap, others might remark on the considerable narrowing of that gap from the adults' proportion of 65%. What is happening? Is this a sign of a strengthening trend for parity in wages, or does it reflect the homogeneity of wages and jobs available to adolescents, who, for the most part, remain clustered in low-pay, entry-level, secondary-market jobs. Only time and further, more detailed and stringently conceived, research will tell.

Second, as with most research on adolescents, adults wonder what is being learned in this experience. Since working while attending school is an important source of information about the labor market, differences in labor market experiences at an early age, which mirror identifiable adult differences, may affect the adolescent's assessment of their future possibilities. What they learn, then, may be colored by the types of jobs--their levels of status and monetary reward--they are likely to have. Is it justifiable to be concerned about the "hidden" lessons a working adolescent is learning from their differential experiences? Are they learning that women earn less, on average, than men? Is high school when they come to accept, and expect, this to remain true? Or need we not worry that the adolescent regards their working experiences to be harbingers of the future? Since the long-term impact of starting early in the labor force in lower-status and lower-paying employment has not yet been satisfactorily addressed, only better research will provide an answer.

Third, the present analysis does not settle the functionalist-structuralist argument. It was not intended to and furthermore, probably could not even if designed for that purpose. The existence of the relationships of gender to the outcome variables (SEI and wage) provide an illustrative

example of the difficulty of unravelling the argument. In the functionalist mode, a young female may choose to work at the higher-status but lower-paying clerical position because of its ease for reentrance and skill transferance. Her personal preferences may make her feel more comfortable working in a sex-appropriate occupation, where her competence may not be as questioned or her femininity at risk. Or, if one were to look at the same female from the structuralist's point of view, she may take the clerk's position because it does not demand highly competitive and extende training and it is all that is open to her at the moment. Her brother is in a management training course with thirty men and only two women; she thought of applying but didn't like her chances.

This digression should serve but one purpose. That is, to ask, albeit without the data at present to answer, what adolescent female workers are learning about themselves, the marketplace, and their futures as they work at their part-time jobs after school. Perhaps they are being "prepared for life" in more ways than one.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angle, J. and Wissmann, D.A. (1983) "Work experience, age, and gender discrimination." Social Science Quarterly, 64, 66-84.

Beck, E.M., Horan, P.M., and Tolbert, C.M. (1978) "Stratification in a dual economy: A sectoral model of earnings determination." American Sociological Review, 43, 704-720.

Beller, A.H. (1982) "Occupational segregation by sex: Determinants and changes." The Journal of Human Resources, 17, 371-392.

Berg, I., Ed. (1981) Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets. Academic Press: New York.

Bibb, R. and Form, W.H. (1977) "The effects of industrial, occupational and sex stratification on wages in blue-collar markets." Social Forces, 55, 974-996.

Blinder, A.S. (1973) "Wage discrimination: Reduced form and structural estimates." The Journal of Human Resources, 8, 436-455.

Blumrosen, R.G. (1980) "Wage discrimination, job segregation, and women workers." Employee Relations Law Journal, 6, 77-136.

Brown, G.D. (1978) "Discrimination and pay disparities between white men and women." Monthly Labor Review, 101, 17-22.

Corcoran, M. and Duncan, G.J. (1979) "Work history, labor force attachment, and earnings differences between the races and sexes." The Journal of Human Resources, 14, 3-20.

Endriss, J.R. and Froomkin, J. (1980) The Labor Market Experiences of 14-to-21-Year Olds. Research on Youth Employment and Employability Development. Youth Knowledge Development Report 2.6. Department of Labor: Washington, D.C.

Featherman, D.L. and Hauser, R.M. (1976) "Sexual inequalities and socioeconomic achievement in the U.S., 1962-1973." American Sociological Review, 41, 462-483.

Filer, R.K. (1983) "Sexual differences in earnings: The role of individual personalities and tastes." Journal of Human Resources, 18, 82-99.

Griffin, L.J., Kalleberg, A.L., and Alexander, K.L. (1981) "Determinants of early labor market entry and attainment: A study of labor market segmentation." Sociology of Education, 54, 206-221.

Gunderson, M. (1978) "The influence of the status and sex composition of occupations on the male-female earnings gap." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 31, 217-226.

Horan, P.M. (1978) "Is status attainment research atheoretical?" American Sociological Review, 43, 534-541.

Kerckhoff, A.D. (1976) "The status attainment process: Socialization or allocation?" Social Forces, 55, 368-381.

King, A.G. (1977) "Is occupational segregation the cause of the flatter experience-earnings profiles of women?" The Journal of Human Resources, 12, 541-549.

Mallan, L.B. (1982) "Labor force participation, work experience, and the pay gap between men and women." The Journal of Human Resources, 17, 437-448.

McClendon, M.J. (1976) "The occupational status attainment process of males and females." American Sociological Review, 41, 52-64.

McLaughlin, S.D. (1978) "Occupational sex identification and the assessment of male and female earnings inequality." American Sociological Review, 43, 909-921.

Medoff, J.L. and Abraham, K.G. (1980) "Experience, performance, and earnings." The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 95, 703-736.

Meyer, K.A. (1984) "Occupational aspirations of high school seniors: Status transmission and vocational choice processes." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Washington: Seattle, Washington.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1981) High School and Beyond. U.S. Dept. of Education: Washington, D.C.

Ohio Dept. of Education. (1984) "Follow-up of Ohio's secondary and post-secondary vocational program completers."

Powers, M.G., Ed. (1982) Measures of Socioeconomic Status. Westview Press: Boulder, Colorado.

Roos, P.A. (1981) "Sex stratification in the workplace: Male-female differences in economic returns to occupation." Social Science Research, 10, 195-224.

Roos, P.A. (1982) Sex Differences in Occupational Attainment: A Twelve-Nation Study. Employment and Training Administration (DOL): Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 753)

Rosenfeld, R.A. (1979) "Women's [illegible]ational careers: Individual and structural explanations." Sociol[illegible]y [illegible]f Work and Occupations, 6, 283-311.

Sewell, W.H., Hauser, R.M., and Wolf, W.D. (1980) "Sex, schooling, and occupational status." American Journal of Sociology, 86, 551-583.

Treiman, D.J. and Roos, P.A. (1983) "Sex and earnings in industrial society: A 9-nation comparison." American Journal of Sociology, 89, 612-650.

Treiman, D.J. and Terrell, K. (1975) "Sex and the process of status attainment: A comparison of working men and women." American Sociological Review, 40, 174-200.

Wolf, W.C. and Rosenfeld, R. (1978) "Sex structure of occupations and job mobility." Social Forces, 56, 823-844.

Young, A.M. (1983) "Youth labor force marked turned point in 1982." Monthly Labor Review, 106, 29-34.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance on Adolescent's Occupational Status (SEI)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Covariates	8211.232	2	4105.616	12.958	.001
X_5	3914.079	1	3914.079	12.353	.001
X_6	3082.703	1	3082.703	9.729	.002
Main Effects	44123.873	6	7353.979	23.210	.001
X_1	8052.462	1	8052.462	25.414	.001
X_2	35683.051	2	17841.526	56.310	.001
X_3	141.102	1	141.102	.445	.505
X_4	462.043	2	231.021	.729	.483
Two-Way	11972.308	13	920.947	2.907	.001
X_1 by X_2	6689.470	2	3344.735	10.556	.001
X_1 by X_3	19.441	1	19.441	.061	.804
X_1 by X_4	621.738	2	310.869	.981	.375
X_2 by X_3	2094.017	2	1047.008	3.304	.065
X_2 by X_4	1865.797	4	466.449	1.472	.209
X_3 by X_4	186.665	2	93.332	.295	.745
Three-Way	3829.636	9	425.515	1.343	.210
X_1 by X_2 by X_3	51.287	2	25.644	.081	.922
X_1 by X_2 by X_4	3250.849	4	812.712	2.565	.037
X_1 by X_3 by X_4	168.033	2	84.016	.265	.767
X_2 by X_3 by X_4	2.267	1	2.267	.007	.933
Explained	68137.049	30	2271.235	7.168	.001
Residual	850412.894	2684	316.845		
Total	918549.943	2714	338.449		

X_1 - Gender, X_2 - Year in school, X_3 - Post-graduation plans, X_4 - Ethnic origin, X_5 - GPA, X_6 - Father's occupational SEI.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance on Adolescent's Wages

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Covariates	72972.459	2	36486.230	2.838	.059
X_5	17145.202	1	17145.202	1.334	.248
X_6	64315.842	1	64315.842	5.002	.026
Main Effects	727780.909	6	121296.818	9.434	.001
X_1	488402.411	1	488402.411	37.988	.001
X_2	240816.051	2	120408.025	9.365	.001
X_3	74.073	1	74.073	.006	.940
X_4	1273.423	2	636.712	.050	.952
Two-Way	308625.602	13	23740.431	1.847	.033
X_1 by X_2	7303.144	2	3651.572	.284	.753
X_1 by X_3	17246.917	1	17246.917	1.341	.247
X_1 by X_4	53721.915	2	26860.958	2.089	.124
X_2 by X_3	74682.462	2	37341.231	2.904	.055
X_2 by X_4	151588.080	4	27897.020	2.948	.019
X_3 by X_4	1209.107	2	604.553	.047	.954
Three-Way	130495.099	7	18642.157	1.450	.182
X_1 by X_2 by X_3	103775.573	2	51887.786	4.036	.018
X_1 by X_2 by X_4	27874.600	4	6968.650	.542	.705
X_1 by X_3 by X_4	286.722	1	286.722	.022	.881
X_2 by X_3 by X_4	(dropped from analysis)				
Explained	1239874.070	28	44281.217	3.444	.001
Residual	16276714.015	1266	12856.804		
Total	17516588.085	1294	13536.776		

X_1 - Gender, X_2 - Year in school, X_3 - Post-graduation plans, X_4 - Ethnic origin, X_5 - GPA, X_6 - Father's occupational SEI.

Table 3

Means (Standard Deviations) of Adolescent's Occupational Status (SEI)

	Sophomores (N=409)	Juniors (N=972)	Seniors (N=1406)	Total (N=2787)
Males (N=1235)	5.03(10.53)	10.87(15.52)	12.17(15.91)	10.70(15.43)
Females (N=1552)	6.32(13.90)	11.49(18.40)	18.91(21.71)	14.42(20.30)
Total (N=2787)	5.77(12.24)	11.22(16.99)	15.89(18.82)	12.77(18.14)

Table 4

Means (Standard Deviations) of Adolescent's Wages

	Sophomores (N=111)	Juniors (N=436)	Seniors (N=827)	Total (N=1374)
Males (N=628)	3.71(0.98)	4.12(1.50)	4.25(1.31)	4.17(1.35)
Females (N=746)	3.50(1.34)	3.62(0.91)	3.88(0.82)	3.77(0.89)
Total (N=1374)	3.59(1.18)	3.87(1.20)	4.04(1.04)	3.95(1.10)